DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 255 SP 033 896

AUTHOR Stolworthy, Reed L.
TITLE The Application of Academic Content to Practice by Preservice Secondary School History and Social Studies Teachers.
PUB DATE Jun 92
NOTE 78p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ability Identification; *Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; History; Methods Research; Preservice Teacher Education; Rating Scales; Secondary Education; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Social Studies; *Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Methods; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Content Area Teaching; *Pedagogical Content Knowledge

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the ability of preservice secondary school history and social studies teachers to transmit knowledge of the subject to students through methodologies designed to translate theory into practice. Participants in the study were 23 student teachers certified to teach history and social studies by Washburn University (Kansas) from spring 1985 through spring 1990 and their respective cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers completed a rating scale and provided data regarding teaching abilities demonstrated by student teachers. Student teachers also provided data by using the same evaluative instrument for assessing their own abilities in history and social studies. The other areas of the evaluation included the student teachers' ability to transmit subject matter to students and to translate theory into practice. Results suggest that cooperating teachers tended to rate student teachers higher than the preservice teachers rated themselves. Five appendices, comprising about 80 percent of this document are: (1) history and social studies tables, the mean and standard deviation; (2) tables ranking mean values derived from the evaluation of student teachers in history; (3) tables ranking mean values derived from the evaluation of student teachers in social studies; (4) tables presenting frequency of response to numerical position on rating scale; and (5) the evaluative instruments. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE APPLICATION OF ACADEMIC CONTENT TO PRACTICE BY PRESERVICE SECONDARY SCHOOL HISTORY AND SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

ED350255

SUBMITTED BY

DR. REED L. STOLWORTHY
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Stolworthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JUNE 1, 1992

SP033896

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. 3

Problem Statement 3

Research Design 4

The Mean and Standard Deviation 5

The Percentile Rank 6

The Chi-Square. 10

Conclusion. 12

Appendix A. 15

History Tables 1-19

Social Studies Tables 20-44

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Appendix B. 60

Tables 45-46

Ranking of Mean Values Derived from the

Evaluation of Student Teachers in History

Appendix C. 65

Tables 47-48

Ranking of Mean Values Derived from the

Evaluation of Student Teachers in Social Studies

Appendix D. 70

Tables 49-50

Frequency of Responses to Numerical Position on

Rating Scale

Appendix E 72

The Evaluative Instruments

THE APPLICATION OF ACADEMIC CONTENT TO PRACTICE BY PRESERVICE SECONDARY SCHOOL HISTORY AND SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

This study of preservice student teachers involved a population of 23 (n = 23) undergraduates certified to teach history and social studies by Washburn University's teacher preparation program from the Spring Semester of 1985 through Spring Semester 1990. The respective cooperating teachers involved in the study (n = 23) provided data regarding the abilities demonstrated by the same student teachers. The student teachers also provided data by using the same evaluative device designed for assessing their own abilities in the secondary school subject fields of history and social studies.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine the preservice secondary school history and social studies teachers' ability to transmit knowledge of subject to students through methodologies designed to translate theory into practice. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What were the perceptions relative to the student teachers' knowledge of the respective subject areas in history and social studies?
2. To what extent were different teaching methods effectively used in transmitting the subject fields to the students?

3. How successful were the student teachers in translating the academic content of history and social studies into relevant practice?

Research Design

Each evaluative instrument utilized in the study was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. The respondents were to check the column labeled NA if they did not observe the undergraduate in a particular competency (Appendix E).

The cooperating teachers involved in the study provided data regarding the abilities demonstrated by the student teachers. The student teachers also provided data by using the same evaluative device designed for assessing their own abilities in the subject fields of history and social studies.

Evaluations were made by the two groups mentioned above relative to the preservice teachers' knowledge of the subject areas of history and social studies. The second area of the instrument dealt with the student teachers' ability to transmit subject matter to the students by using lectures, demonstrations, models, and data analysis. The third and last part of the rating instrument measured the student teachers' ability to translate theory into practice through well designed projects, clear procedures, well defined objectives, fully explained results, and projects that were meaningful to the students.

The data obtained from the above respondents at the end of student teaching was tabulated and analyzed through the application of computer technology. The quantitative results were expressed through descriptive and inferential statistics.

It can readily be noticed that the left hand column of tables 1 through 19 (Appendix A) depicts the results obtained from the utilization of the rating scale with 1 indicating incompetence, 5 indicating total competence, and NA if the undergraduate was not observed in performing a particular competency and/or simply did not have the opportunity to demonstrate the ability specified on the rating scale. The numbers listed across the tables indicate the frequency of responses received at each of the points on the rating scale by each of the respective groups. The mean values and standard deviations pertaining to each of the competencies are listed at the bottom of each table.

The Mean and Standard Deviation

Tables 1 through 19 (Appendix A) illustrates the mean scores and standard deviations for the nineteen abilities related to teaching history as represented by the student teachers from Spring Semester 1985 through Spring Semester 1990. Tables 20 through 44 (Appendix A) show the results of the same statistical procedures as applied to the twenty-five abilities considered in the teaching of social studies.

The Percentile Rank

In order to determine the position of each derived mean value, the percentile rank was determined. The percentile rank shows the relative position of each case in the distribution, expressed in terms of the ordinal number corresponding to the centile interval in which the case is placed. The rank order shows the distribution of the series of assessments that have been arranged according to their relative magnitudes or positions, that is, from highest to lowest in the series for each of the respective groups.

Table 45 (Appendix B) shows the ranking of the mean values derived through the application of descriptive statistics to the data obtained from the respondents relative to the teaching of history. It can readily be noted that the highest mean values obtained from the cooperating teachers were in the area dealing with the student teachers' knowledge of the subject areas of history dealt with the area of the United States (1865 to Present) (Mean = 4.75) (P.R. = 97.37). The smallest mean value derived was relative to economic history (Mean = 3.63) (P.R.= 2.63). Table 45 also depicts the abilities relative to transmitting the subject to the students through the application of different teaching methods. According to the perceptions of the cooperating teachers, the strongest teaching ability was illustrated through the student teachers' use of maps (Mean = 4.53) (P.R. = 92.11). In

evaluating the ability to transmit the subject to the students, the smallest mean value was relative to the use of a variety of teaching techniques (Mean = 4.19) (P.R. = 26.32). In addition, Table 45 provides insights regarding the student teachers' ability to translate theory into practice. Using projects meaningful to students was regarded as the student teachers' strongest ability in translating theory into practice (Mean = 4.33) (P.R.= 60.53). The smallest mean value (Mean = 4.13) (P.R. = 18.42) dealt with the ability to fully explain results.

Table 46 (Appendix B) illustrates the ranking of the mean values as related to the student teachers' self-evaluation. The mean values depict the student teachers perceiving themselves as being most knowledgeable in the subject area of the United States (1865 to Present) (Mean = 4.50) (P.R.= 97.37). The smallest mean was relative to the student teachers' knowing the subject field of economic history (Mean = 3.50) (P.R.= 2.63). Table 22 also dealt with the student teachers' ability relative to transmitting the subject to the student through the use of different teaching methods. It can readily be noticed that the highest mean value derived concerning a teaching method was through the use of tests reflecting material and evoking thought and understanding (Mean = 4.14) (P.R.= 78.95). The smallest Mean value was in the use of original sources to transmit the subject to the students (Mean = 3.57) (P.R. = 7.89).

Table 46 further shows the student teachers' ability to translate theory into practice through the use of various approaches. The use of projects meaningful to students had the highest mean value (Mean = 4.14) (P.R. = 78.95). The smallest mean was relative to using well-defined objectives (Mean = 3.87) (P. R. = 23.68).

Table 47 shows the ranking of the mean values derived from the respondents relative to teaching social studies. It can readily be noted that the highest mean values obtained from the cooperating teachers' evaluations in the area dealing with the student teachers' knowledge of the subject areas dealt with the teaching of Anglo-American (Mean = 5.00) (P.R. = 96.00). The lowest mean value relative to knowledge of subject area pertained to the United States (1492 to 1865) with a mean of 4.25 and a percentile rank of 12.00.

In addition, Table 47 depicts the abilities relative to transmitting the subject to the students through the application of different teaching methods. According to the perceptions of the cooperating teacher, the strongest ability was illustrated through the student teachers' use of lectures (Mean = 4.43) (P.R. = 40.00). The smallest mean in this area was in the ability to transmit the subject to the students through the use of data analysis (Mean = 4.14) (P.R. = 2.00). Further, Table 47 provides insight regarding

the student teachers' ability to translate theory into practice. Using well-defined objectives (Mean = 4.71) (P.R. = 74) was regarded as the student teachers' strongest ability in translating theory into practice. Using clear procedures, fully explained results, and meaningful projects were the lowest in the above area with a mean of 4.43 and percentile rank of 40.00, respectively.

Table 48 shows the ranking of the mean values derived from the student teachers' self-evaluation regarding the teaching of social studies. It can readily be noted that the highest mean values obtained from the student teachers' evaluations in the area dealing with knowledge of subject areas was in the area of teaching western civilization (Mean = 5.00) (P.R. = 96.00). The lowest mean value relative to knowledge of subject area dealt with spatial economics behavior (Mean = 4.00) (P.R. = 8.00). In addition, Table 48 illustrates the abilities relative to transmitting the subject to the students through the application of different teaching methods. According to the perceptions of the student teachers, the strongest ability was in using lectures (Mean = 4.75) (P.R. = 86.00). The smallest derived mean relative to using teaching methods was in the use of demonstrations and models, respectively (Mean = 4.00) (P.R. = 8.00).

Also shown in Table 48 are the student teachers' perceptions regarding their ability to translate theory into

practice. Using projects that were meaningful to the student (Mean = 4.50) (P.R. = 8.00) was viewed as the strongest. Whereas, their ability to fully explain the results of the academic content was the lowest Mean value derived (Mean = 4.00) (P.R. = 8.00).

A mean value of 5.00 would infer total competence in the abilities mentioned above.

The Chi-Square

Since the chi-square has been considered as either a parametric or non-parametric statistic; it is a test of significance appropriate in inferential statistics for such nominal data as head counts or frequency counts. Conceptually, a chi-square test compares the observed frequencies with the expected frequencies to determine if they are significantly different from each other.

Table 49 (Appendix D) illustrates the frequency of the evaluative responses which occurred at each level of the rating scale relative to the two groups of evaluators in the teaching of history.

The chi-square was applied to determine the significance of the differences between the frequencies of occurrence of a rating received at each point on the rating scale for responses to each of the respective rating scales for the student teachers in history and social studies. Table 49 shows the chi-square value of 21.558 for the responses obtained in the teaching of history. Further, Table 50 illustrates the chi-square value of 18.249 for the respondents engaged in the teaching of social studies In

examining the Chi-Square Table of Critical Values relative to the chi-square values of 21.558 and 18.249 with 4 degrees of freedom, each was found to have a probability level of significance of less than .01. For the purposes of this study, the probability level of .05 was selected as the desired level of significance. Since the probability level .05 was selected as the level of significance, then any value greater than 5 percent would mean that the data had not obtained statistical significance. Thus, the probability in this study is fewer than one time out of one hundred that the obtained results were due to chance or error. In other words, if the study was conducted 100 times, the same differences between the groups would be attributed to significant differences more than 99 times out of one hundred. However, less than one time out of a hundred ($p < .01$), those differences would be attributed to chance or error.

Thus, Tables 49 and 50 illustrate the frequency and the differences of the evaluative responses made by the cooperating teachers and the student teachers at each level of the rating scale in the evaluative process relative to the teaching of history and social studies.

Conclusion

The cooperating teachers involved in this study provided data regarding the teaching abilities demonstrated by the student teachers through responding to a rating scale. The student teachers also provided data by responding to the same instrument which was based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence.

The self-evaluation applied by the cooperating teachers in history obtained higher mean values on each of the nineteen abilities. Those higher mean values pertained to the preservice teachers' knowledge of European civilization, United States (to 1865), United States (1865 to Present) - political history, economic history, world history, global diplomacy, and appropriate social, cultural, and intellectual history including race, religion, and nationality; and the ability to transmit the subject to students using lectures, variety of teaching techniques, original sources, maps, good preparation, good organization and tests reflecting material evoking thought and understanding; and the ability to translate theory into practice through using well designed projects, clear procedures, well defined objectives, fully explained results, and projects that were meaningful to the students. The total mean value for each of the respective groups

relative to all of the nineteen mean values related to the teaching of history indicated that the cooperating teachers tended to rate the pre-service teachers higher as indicated above (e.g. Total Mean = 4.29) than the student teachers rated themselves in history (e.g. Total Mean = 3.97).

The self-evaluation applied by the cooperating teachers in social studies obtained higher mean values on sixteen of the twenty-five abilities. Those higher mean values pertained to the preservice teachers' knowledge of man's physical environment, the non-American World, cultural geography, Anglo-American, political geography, urban geography, spatial economic behavior, economic history, American society, and social, cultural, and intellectual history; and the ability to transmit the subject to students using demonstrations and models; and the ability to translate theory into practice through using well designed projects, clear procedures, well defined objectives, fully explained results, fully explained applications, and projects that were meaningful to the students. In comparison, there were seven instances when the highest mean values were obtained from the ratings provided by the student teachers. Those respective ratings pertained to the preservice teachers' abilities as related to knowledge of the United States (1492-1865), United States (1865-Present) and Political History; and the ability to transmit the subject to students using lectures and the ability to translate theory into practice by fully explaining the

results and by engaging students in meaningful projects. The same mean value was obtain by each of the two respective groups in social studies relative to knowledge of western civilization and global diplomacy. The total mean value for each of the respective groups relative to all of the twenty-five mean values related to the teaching of social studies indicated that the cooperating teachers tended to rate the preservice teachers higher (e.g. Total Mean = 4.51) than the student teachers rated themselves in social studies (e.g. Total Mean = 4.41).

The chi-square test was applied to determine the significance of the differences between the frequencies of occurrence of a rating received at each point on the rating scale by the two groups of evaluators for teaching history and social studies, respectively. The chi-square score 21.558 (with 4 degrees of freedom) was obtained for history and 18.249 for social studies. Thus, the probability level of significance was less than .01 for the evaluative outcomes for the subject fields of history and and also for social studies. Thus, the probability is less than 1 time out of one hundred that the obtained results of significant differences were due to chance or error.

APPENDIX A

TABLES 1-19

THE MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION

TABLE 1

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN HISTORY

ITEM 1-KNOWLEDGE OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-90 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	2	4
4	5	3
5	3	4
Competent		
NA	6	4
Mean	4.10	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.74	0.89

TABLE 2

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN HISTORY

ITEM 2-KNOWLEDGE OF UNITED STATES (TO 1865)

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	3
4	4	3
5	3	5
Competent		
NA	9	4
Mean	4.43	4.18
Standard Deviation	0.53	0.87

TABLE 3

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN HISTORY

ITEM 3-KNOWLEDGE OF UNITED STATES (1865 TO PRESENT)

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	2	6
5	6	6
Competent		
NA	10	3
Mean	4.75	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.73	0.52

TABLE 4

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN HISTORY

ITEM 4-KNOWLEDGE OF POLITICAL HISTORY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	2	2
4	6	3
5	5	6
Competent		
NA	3	3
Mean	4.23	4.17
Standard Deviation	0.73	1.03

TABLE 5

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN HISTORY

ITEM 5-KNOWLEDGE OF ECONOMIC HISTORY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	1	1
3	2	4
4	4	4
5	1	1
Competent		
NA	8	5
Mean	3.63	3.50
Standard Deviation	0.92	0.85

TABLE 6

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN HISTORY

ITEM 6-KNOWLEDGE OF WORLD HISTORY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	3	4
4	3	4
5	4	4
Competent		
NA	8	3
Mean	4.10	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.88	0.85

TABLE 7

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN HISTORY

ITEM 7-KNOWLEDGE OF GLOBAL DIPLOMACY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	2
3	0	1
4	4	3
5	4	4
Competent		
NA	9	5
Mean	4.50	3.90
Standard Deviation	0.53	1.20

TABLE 8

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN HISTORY

ITEM 8-KNOWLEDGE OF APPROPRIATE SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND INTELLECTUAL HISTORY INCLUDING MINORITIES OF RACE, RELIGION, NATIONALITY, AND AGE,

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	5
4	5	4
5	7	4
Competent		
NA	3	2
Mean	4.46	3.92
Standard Deviation	0.66	0.86

TABLE 9

PART B-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT

ITEM 9-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT THROUGH THE USE OF LECTURES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	4	5
4	4	5
5	8	5
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.25	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.86	0.85

TABLE 10

PART B-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT

ITEM 10-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT THROUGH THE USE OF A VARIETY OF TEACHING TECHNIQUES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	1	1
3	2	7
4	6	2
5	7	5
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.19	3.73
Standard Deviation	0.91	1.03

TABLE 11

PART B-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE STUDENTS

ITEM 11-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENTS THROUGH THE USE OF ORIGINAL SOURCES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	2	7
4	6	3
5	6	3
Competent		
NA	2	1
Mean	4.29	3.57
Standard Deviation	0.73	0.94

TABLE 12

PART B-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT

ITEM 12-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT THROUGH THE USE OF MAPS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	1
2	0	0
3	1	5
4	5	4
5	9	5
Competent		
NA	1	0
Mean	4.53	3.80
Standard Deviation	0.64	1.15

TABLE 13

PART B-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT

ITEM 13-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT THROUGH GOOD PREPARATION AND ORGANIZATION

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	1	1
3	1	2
4	3	6
5	10	6
Competent		
NA	1	0
Mean	4.47	4.13
Standard Deviation	0.92	0.92

TABLE 14

PART B-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT

ITEM 14-ABILITY TO INSTRUCT AND EVALUATE THE STUDENT THROUGH THE USE OF TESTS THAT REFLECT THE MATERIAL AND EVOKE THOUGHT AND UNDERSTANDING ON THE PART OF THE STUDENT

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	1
3	2	1
4	6	7
5	8	5
Competent		
NA	0	1
Mean	4.38	4.14
Standard Deviation	0.72	0.86

TABLE 15

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 15-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE TROUGH PROJECTS WELL-DESIGNED

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	3
4	9	7
5 Competent	5	3
NA	1	2
Mean	4.27	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.59	0.71

TABLE 16

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 16-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE THROUGH THE USE OF CLEAR PROCEDURES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	3
4	9	9
5	6	3
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.31	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.60	0.65

TABLE 17

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 17-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE THROUGH WELL-DEFINED OBJECTIVES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	1	0
3	2	4
4	6	9
5	7	2
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.19	3.87
Standard Deviation	0.91	0.64

TABLE 18

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 18-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE THROUGH USING FULLY EXPLAINED RESULTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	1	0
3	3	5
4	5	6
5	7	4
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.13	3.93
Standard Deviation	0.96	0.80

TABLE 19

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 19-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE THROUGH PROJECTS MEANINGFUL TO STUDENTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=16	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=15
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	2
4	8	8
5	6	4
Competent		
NA	1	1
Mean	4.33	4.14
Standard Deviation	0.62	0.66

TABLE 20

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 1-MAN'S PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-90 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	1	4
5	3	2
Competent		
NA	3	2
Mean	4.75	4.33
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.52

TABLE 21

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 2-THE NON-AMERICAN WORLD

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	2	2
5	3	3
Competent		
NA	2	2
Mean	4.60	4.33
Standard Deviation	0.55	0.82

TABLE 22

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 3-CULTURAL GEOGRAPHY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	0
4	1	4
5	3	2
Competent		
NA	2	2
Mean	4.40	4.33
Standard Deviation	0.89	0.52

TABLE 23

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 4-GEOGRAPHY SKILLS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	3	3
5	4	5
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.57	4.63
Standard Deviation	0.53	0.52

TABLE 24

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 5-ANGLO-AMERICAN

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	0	3
5	4	3
Competent		
NA	3	2
Mean	5.00	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.55

TABLE 25

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 6-POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	2	4
5	4	2
Competent		
NA	1	1
Mean	4.67	4.33
Standard Deviation	0.52	0.52

TABLE 26

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 7-URBAN GEOGRAPHY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	1	2
5	3	3
Competent		
NA	3	2
Mean	4.75	4.33
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.82

TABLE 27

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 8-SPATIAL ECONOMIC BEHAVIOR

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	1	2
5	1	1
Competent		
NA	5	4
Mean	4.50	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.71	0.82

TABLE 28

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 9-WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	3	6
Competent		
NA	4	2
Mean	5.00	5.00
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.00

TABLE 29

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 10-UNITED STATES (1492-1865)

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	3	1
5	1	5
Competent		
NA	3	2
Mean	4.25	4.83
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.41

TABLE 30

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 11-UNITED STATES (1865-PRESENT

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	2	0
5	1	6
Competent		
NA	4	2
Mean	4.33	5.00
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.00

TABLE 31

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT AREA IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 12-POLITICAL HISTORY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	3	1
5	2	5
Competent		
NA	2	1
Mean	4.40	4.57
Standard Deviation	0.55	0.79

TABLE 32

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT FIELD IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 13-ECONOMIC HISTORY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	2
4	3	2
5	2	3
Competent		
NA	2	1
Mean	4.40	4.14
Standard Deviation	0.55	0.90

TABLE 33

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT FIELD IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 14-AMERICAN SOCIETY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	1	3
5	4	4
Competent		
NA	2	1
Mean	4.80	4.57
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.53

TABLE 34

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT FIELD IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 15-GLOBAL DIPLOMACY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	2
4	2	0
5	2	6
Competent		
NA	3	0
Mean	4.50	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.58	0.93

TABLE 35

PART A-KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT FIELD IN SOCIAL STUDIES

ITEM 16-SOCIAL, CULTURAL, AND INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	2
4	1	2
5	3	3
Competent		
NA	3	1
Mean	4.75	4.14
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.90

TABLE 36

PART B-ABILITY TO TRANSMIT SUBJECT TO STUDENT

ITEM 17-USING LECTURES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	4	2
5	3	6
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.43	4.75
Standard Deviation	0.53	0.46

TABLE 37

PART B-ABILITY TO TRANSMIT SUBJECT TO STUDENT

ITEM 18-USING DEMONSTRATIONS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	3
4	4	2
5	1	3
Competent		
NA	2	0
Mean	4.20	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.45	0.93

TABLE 38

PART B-ABILITY TO TRANSMIT SUBJECT TO STUDENT

ITEM 19-USING MODELS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	3
4	3	2
5	1	3
Competent		
NA	3	0
Mean	4.25	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.50	0.93

TABLE 39

PART B-ABILITY TO TRANSMIT SUBJECT TO STUDENT

ITEM 20-USING ANALYSIS OF DATA

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-90 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	6	3
5	1	5
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.14	4.63
Standard Deviation	0.38	0.52

TABLE 40

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 21-USING WELL DESIGNED-PROJECTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	3	5
5	3	3
Competent		
NA	1	0
Mean	4.50	4.38
Standard Deviation	0.55	0.52

TABLE 41

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 22-USING CLEAR PROCEDURES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	2
4	4	3
5	3	3
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.43	4.13
Standard Deviation	0.53	0.83

TABLE 42

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 23-USING WELL-DEFINED OBJECTIVES

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	2	3
5	5	4
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.71	4.38
Standard Deviation	0.49	0.74

TABLE 43

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 24-USING FULLY EXPLAINED RESULTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	3
4	4	2
5	3	3
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.43	4.00
Standard Deviation	0.53	0.93

TABLE 44

PART C-ABILITY TO TRANSLATE THEORY INTO PRACTICE

ITEM 25-USING PROJECTS MEANINGFUL TO STUDENTS

Incom-petent	Cooperating Teachers 1985-1990 N=7	Student Teachers 1985-1990 N=8
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	0	1
4	4	2
5	3	5
Competent		
NA	0	0
Mean	4.43	4.50
Standard Deviation	0.53	0.76

APPENDIX B

TABLES 45 - 46

THE RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM THE EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN THE FIELD OF HISTORY FROM 1985 - 1990

TABLE 45

RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM THE COOPERATING TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN HISTORY FROM 1985-1990

Competency of Preservice Teacher	Mean Value N=16	Percentile Rank of Mean Value
Part A- Knowledge of Subject Area:		
1. European Civilization	4.10	10.53
2. United States (to 1865)	4.43	71.05
3. United States (1865 to Present)	4.75	97.37
4. Political History	4.23	34.21
5. Economic History	3.63	2.63
6. World History	4.10	10.53
7. Global Diplomacy	4.50	86.84
8. Appropriate social, cultural, and intellectual history including race, religion, nationality etc.	4.46	76.32
Part B-Ability to Transmit Subject to Students Using:		
9. Lectures	4.25	39.47
10. Variety of Teaching Techniques	4.19	26.32
11. Original Sources	4.29	50.00
12. Maps	4.53	92.11
13. Good Preparation and Organization	4.47	81.58
14. Tests Reflecting Material and Evoking Thought and Understanding	4.38	65.79

TABLE 45 - CONTINUED

RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM COOPERATING TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN HISTORY 1985-1990

Competency of Preservice Teacher	Mean Value N=16	Percentile Rank of Mean Value
Part C- Ability to Translate Theory Into Practice:		
15. Are Projects Well Designed	4.27	44.74
16. Are Procedures Clear	4.31	55.26
17. Are Objectives Well Defined	4.19	26.32
18. Are Results Fully Explained	4.13	18.42
19. Are Projects Meaningful to Students	4.33	60.53

Scale for Mean Values: 5.00 = total competence; 1:00 = incompetence

TABLE 46

RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM THE SELF-EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN HISTORY FROM 1985-1990

Competency of Preservice Teacher	Mean Value N=15	Percentile Rank of Mean Value
Part A- Knowledge of Subject Area:		
1. European Civilization	4.00	55.26
2. United States (to 1865)	4.18	92.11
3. United States (1865 to Present)	4.50	97.37
4. Political History	4.17	86.84
5. Economic History	3.50	2.63
6. World History	4.00	55.26
7. Global Diplomacy	3.90	28.95
8. Appropriate social, cultural, and intellectual history including race, religion, nationality etc.	3.92	34.21
Part B-Ability to Transmit Subject to Students Using:		
9. Lectures	4.00	55.26
10. Variety of Teaching Techniques	3.73	13.16
11. Original Sources	3.57	7.89
12. Maps	3.80	18.42
13. Good Preparation and Organization	4.13	71.05
14. Tests Reflecting Material and Evoking Thought and Understanding	4.14	78.95

TABLE 46 - CONTINUED

RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM STUDENT TEACHERS' SELF-EVALUATION IN HISTORY FROM 1985 TO 1990

Competency of Preservice Teacher	Mean Value N=15	Percentile Rank of Mean Value
Part C- Ability to Translate Theory Into Practice:		
15. Are Projects Well Designed	4.00	55.26
16. Are Procedures Clear	4.00	55.26
17. Are Objectives Well Defined	3.87	23.68
18. Are Results Fully Explained	3.93	39.47
19. Are Projects Meaningful to Students	4.14	78.95

Scale for Mean Values: 5.00 = total competence; 1:00 = incompetence

APPENDIX C

TABLES 47-48

THE RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM THE EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL STUDIES FROM 1985 - 1990

TABLE 47

RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM THE COOPERATING TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN SOCIAL STUDIES FROM 1985-1990

Competency of Preservice Teacher	Mean Value N=7	Percentile Rank of Mean Value
Part A- Knowledge of Subject Area:		
1. Man's Physical Environment	4.75	82.00
2. The Non-American World	4.60	66.00
3. Cultural Geography	4.40	26.00
4. Geography Skills	4.57	62.00
5. Anglo-American	5.00	96.00
6. Political Geography	4.67	70.00
7. Urban Geography	4.75	82.00
8. Spatial Economic Behavior	4.50	54.00
9. Western Civilization	5.00	96.00
10. United States (1492-1865)	4.25	12.00
11. United States (1865-Present)	4.33	18.00
12. Political History	4.40	26.00
13. Economic History	4.40	26.00
14. American Society	4.80	90.00
15. Global Diplomacy	4.50	54.00
16. Social, Cultural, and Intellectual History	4.75	82.00

TABLE 47 - CONTINUED

RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM COOPERATING TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN SOCIAL STUDIES 1985-1990

Competency of Preservice Teacher	Mean Value N=7	Percentile Rank of Mean Value
Part B-Ability to Transmit Subject to Students Using:		
17. Lectures	4.43	40.00
18. Demonstrations	4.20	6.00
19. Models	4.25	12.00
20. Data Analysis	4.14	2.00
Part C- Ability to Translate Theory Into Practice:		
21. Are Projects Well Designed	4.50	54.00
22. Are Procedures Clear	4.43	40.00
23. Are Objectives Well Defined	4.71	74.00
24. Are Results Fully Explained	4.43	40.00
25. Are Projects Meaningful to the Student	4.43	40.00

Scale for Mean Values: 5.00 = total competence; 1:00 = incompetence

TABLE 48

RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM THE STUDENT TEACHERS' SELF-EVALUATION IN SOCIAL STUDIES FROM 1985-1990

Competency of Preservice Teacher	Mean Value N=8	Percentile Rank of Mean Value
Part A- Knowledge of Subject Area:		
1. Man's Physical Environment	4.33	38.00
2. The Non-American World	4.33	38.00
3. Cultural Geography	4.33	38.00
4. Geography Skills	4.63	80.00
5. Anglo-American	4.50	62.00
6. Political Geography	4.33	38.00
7. Urban Geography	4.33	38.00
8. Spatial Economic Behavior	4.00	8.00
9. Western Civilization	5.00	96.00
10. United States (1492-1865)	4.83	90.00
11. United States (1865-Present)	5.00	96.00
12. Political History	4.57	72.00
13. Economic History	4.14	24.00
14. American Society	4.57	72.00
15. Global Diplomacy	4.50	62.00
16. Social, Cultural, and Intellectual History	4.14	24.00

TABLE 48 - CONTINUED

RANKING OF MEAN VALUES DERIVED FROM STUDENT TEACHERS' SELF-EVALUATION IN SOCIAL STUDIES FROM 1985 TO 1990

Competency of Preservice Teacher	Mean Value N=8	Percentile Rank of Mean Value
Part B-Ability to Transmit Subject to Students Using:		
17. Lectures	4.75	86.00
18. Demonstrations	4.00	8.00
19. Models	4.00	8.00
20. Data Analysis	4.63	80.00
Part C- Ability to Translate Theory Into Practice:		
21. Are Projects Well Designed	4.38	52.00
22. Are Procedures Clear	4.13	18.00
23. Are Objectives Well Defined	4.38	52.00
24. Are Results Fully Explained	4.00	8.00
25. Are Projects Meaningful to the Student	4.50	62.00

Scale for Mean Values: 5.00 = total competence; 1:00 = incompetence

APPENDIX D

TABLES 49-50

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO NUMERICAL POSITION ON RATING SCALE BY COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS

TABLE 49

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO NUMERICAL POSITIONS ON RATING SCALE BY COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS IN HISTORY FROM 1985-1990

Rating Scale =	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Cooperating Teachers' Frequency of Response =	0	5	30	100	112
Student Teachers' Frequency of Response =	1	8	67	96	79
Total =	1	13	97	196	191

Chi-Square = 21.558

p = <.01 level of significance

TABLE 50

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO NUMERICAL POSITIONS ON RATING SCALE BY COOPERATING TEACHERS AND STUDENT TEACHERS IN SOCIAL STUDIES FROM 1985-1990

Rating Scale =	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Cooperating Teachers' Frequency of Response =	0	0	1	60	66
Student Teachers' Frequency of Response =	0	0	23	57	94
Total =	0	0	24	117	160

Chi-Square = 18.249

p = <.01 level of significance

APPENDIX E

THE EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

TEACHING FIELD: HISTORY
COMPLETED BY THE COOPERATING TEACHER

Directions: Rate the Student Teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
A. Knowledge of subject area						
1. European Civilization	___	___	___	___	___	____
2. United States (to 1865)	___	___	___	___	___	____
3. United States (1865 to present)	___	___	___	___	___	____
4. Political History	___	___	___	___	___	____
5. Economic History	___	___	___	___	___	____
6. World History	___	___	___	___	___	____
7. Global Diplomacy	___	___	___	___	___	____
8. Appropriate social, cultural and intellectual history including minorities of race, religion, nationality, age, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___
B. Ability to instruct and evaluate the student through the use of	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9. Lectures	___	___	___	___	___	____
10. Variety of teaching techniques	___	___	___	___	___	____
11. Original sources	___	___	___	___	___	____
12. Maps	___	___	___	___	___	____
13. Good preparation and organization	___	___	___	___	___	____
14. Tests that reflect the material and evoke thought and understanding on the part of the student	___	___	___	___	___	____
C. Ability to translate theory into practice	1	2	3	4	5	NA
15. Are projects well-designed	___	___	___	___	___	____
16. Are procedures clear	___	___	___	___	___	____
17. Are objectives well-defined	___	___	___	___	___	____
18. Are results fully explained	___	___	___	___	___	____
19. Are projects meaningful to students	___	___	___	___	___	____

TEACHING FIELD: HISTORY
(Completed by the Student Teacher)

Directions: In order to evaluate your performance during student teaching, please rate your competence on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if the item is not applicable to your situation.

		1	2	3	4	5	NA
A.	Knowledge of subject area						
1.	European Civilization	___	___	___	___	___	____
2.	United States (to 1865)	___	___	___	___	___	____
3.	United States (1885 to present)	___	___	___	___	___	____
4.	Political History	___	___	___	___	___	____
5.	Economic History	___	___	___	___	___	____
6.	World History	___	___	___	___	___	____
7.	Global Diplomacy	___	___	___	___	___	____
8.	Appropriate social, cultural, and intellectual history including minorities of race, religion, nationality, age, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	____
B.	Ability to instruct and evaluate the student through the use of:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9.	Lectures	___	___	___	___	___	____
10.	Variety of teaching techniques	___	___	___	___	___	____
11.	Original sources	___	___	___	___	___	____
12.	Maps	___	___	___	___	___	____
13.	Good preparation & Organization	___	___	___	___	___	____
14.	Tests that reflect the material and evoke thought and understanding on the part of the student	___	___	___	___	___	____
C.	Ability to translate theory into practice	1	2	3	4	5	NA
15.	Are projects well-designed	___	___	___	___	___	____
16.	Are procedures clear	___	___	___	___	___	____
17.	Are objectives well-defined	___	___	___	___	___	____
18.	Are results fully explained	___	___	___	___	___	____
19.	Are projects meaningful to students	___	___	___	___	___	____

TEACHING FIELD: SOCIAL STUDIES
MIDDLE SCHOOL
(Completed by the Cooperating Teacher)

DIRECTIONS: Rate the Student Teacher's performance on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not observe the student teacher in a particular competency.

		1	2	3	4	5	NA
A.	Knowledge of subject area:						
	1. Man's Physical Environment	___	___	___	___	___	____
	2. The Non-American World	___	___	___	___	___	____
	3. Cultural Geography	___	___	___	___	___	____
	4. Geography Skills	___	___	___	___	___	____
	5. Anglo-American	___	___	___	___	___	____
	6. Political Geography	___	___	___	___	___	____
	7. Urban Geography	___	___	___	___	___	____
	8. Spatial Economic Behavior	___	___	___	___	___	____
	9. Western Civilization	___	___	___	___	___	____
	10. United States (1492-1865)	___	___	___	___	___	____
	11. United States (1865-present)	___	___	___	___	___	____
	12. Political History	___	___	___	___	___	____
	13. Economic History	___	___	___	___	___	____
	14. American Society	___	___	___	___	___	____
	15. Global Diplomacy	___	___	___	___	___	____
	16. Social, Cultural, and Intellectual History	___	___	___	___	___	____
B.	Ability to transmit subject to student using:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
	17. Lectures	___	___	___	___	___	____
	18. Demonstrations	___	___	___	___	___	____
	19. Models	___	___	___	___	___	____
	20. Analyzing Data	___	___	___	___	___	____
C.	Ability to translate theory into practice:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
	21. Are projects well-designed	___	___	___	___	___	____
	22. Are procedures clear	___	___	___	___	___	____
	23. Are objectives well-defined	___	___	___	___	___	____
	24. Are results fully explained	___	___	___	___	___	____
	25. Are projects meaningful to students	___	___	___	___	___	____

TEACHING FIELD: SOCIAL STUDIES
MIDDLE SCHOOL
(Completed by the Student Teacher)

DIRECTIONS: In order to evaluate your performance during student teaching, please rate your competence on the following items. Use a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating incompetence and 5 indicating total competence. Check the column labeled NA if you did not perform a particular competency.

		1	2	3	4	5	NA
A.	Knowledge of subject area:						
	1. Man's Physical Environment						
	2. The Non-American World						
	3. Cultural Geography						
	4. Geography Skills						
	5. Anglo-American						
	6. Political Geography						
	7. Urban Geography						
	8. Spatial Economic Behavior						
	9. Western Civilization						
	10. United States (1492-1865)						
	11. United States (1865-present)						
	12. Political History						
	13. Economic History						
	14. American Society						
	15. Global Diplomacy						
	16. Social, Cultural, and Intellectual History						
B.	Ability to transmit subject to student using:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
	17. Lectures						
	18. Demonstrations						
	19. Models						
	20. Analyzing Data						
C.	Ability to translate theory into practice:	1	2	3	4	5	NA
	21. Are projects well-designed						
	22. Are procedures clear						
	23. Are objectives well-defined						
	24. Are results fully explained						
	25. Are projects meaningful to students						